	Case 2:11-cv-00955-KJD-GWF Document 18 Filed 11/29/11 Page 1 of 2
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
7	
8	MILAGROS RAYRAY SURATOS, )
9	Petitioner, ) 2:11-cv-00955-KJD-GWF
10	vs. ) ORDER
11	CAROLYN MYLES, et al.,
12	Respondents.
13	
14	
15	This action was dismissed by the Court upon a motion to dismiss that went unopposed
16	by the petitioner (ECF No. 12). Petitioner has filed an appeal (ECF No. 14).
17	In order to proceed with an appeal from this court, petitioner must receive a certificate
18	of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1). Generally, a petitioner must make "a substantial showing of
19	the denial of a constitutional right" to warrant a certificate of appealability. <i>Id</i> . The Supreme Court has
20	held that a petitioner "must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment
21	of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." <i>Slack v. McDaniel</i> , 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).
22	The Supreme Court further illuminated the standard for issuance of a certificate of
23	appealability in <i>Miller-El v. Cockrell</i> , 537 U.S. 322 (2003). The Court stated in that case:
24	We do not require petitioner to prove, before the issuance of a COA, that some jurists would grant the petition for habeas corpus. Indeed, a claim
25	can be debatable even though every jurist of reason might agree, after the COA has been granted and the case has received full consideration, that
26	petitioner will not prevail. As we stated in <i>Slack</i> , "[w]here a district court has rejected the constitutional claims on the merits, the showing required
	,i

	Case 2:11-cv-00955-KJD-GWF Document 18 Filed 11/29/11 Page 2 of 2
1 2	to satisfy § 2253(c) is straightforward: The petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong."
3	
4	Id. at 1040 (quoting Slack, 529 U.S. at 484).
5	The Court has considered the issues raised by petitioner, with respect to whether they
6	satisfy the standard for issuance of a certificate of appeal, and the Court determines that none meet that
7	standard. Accordingly, the Court will deny petitioner a certificate of appealability.
8	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner is DENIED A CERTIFICATE OF
9	APPEALABILITY.
10	DATED: November 29, 2011
11	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13	ONTED STATES DISTRICT JODGE
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	-2-